

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed March 29, 2005, the Examiner noted that claims 1-13 were pending, and rejected all claims. Claims 1, 3 and 9-13 have been amended, new claim 14 has been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-14 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

In the Action, the Examiner rejected all claims under 35 USC sections 102 or 103 over various combinations of Abulliel, DeRose and Li.

An interview was conducted with the Examiners and the contents of the interview are discussed below.

It was pointed out in the interview as depicted in figures 5 and 6 of the application, that the embodiments of the invention variously combine ("combining") contents of node elements of a structured document in a way that reduces or decreases ("decreasing") the number of elements of the structured document and that "preserve a text relationship between the contents" (see, for example, claim 1). As depicted in figures 5 and 6 a text relationship ("first", "second", "third", "fourth") of nodes at a level (72) in figure 5 is preserved in figure 6 in node 75 and the number of nodes is reduced. As a result, the records of the structured document are compressed.

As discussed with the Examiner, DeRose attaches new elements as a child associated with a top of a stack and does not combine elements to preserve a text relationship there between. Li destroys information by lumping leaves into bins. Abulliel is about strategic planning and not about structured documents and adds nothing to DeRose or Li relative to the variations of the invention.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 2 calls for restoring a record (uncompressing) when a search finds a compressed record that has a search term in it. The prior art does not teach or suggest such. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

New claim 14 emphasizes compressing the hierarchy of the structured document by combining element contents and preserving the relationship there between. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that the new claim, which is different and not

narrower than prior filed claims, distinguishes over the prior art.

It is submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 09/29/15

By: 

J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501